

QUERIES

UPON

QUERIES:

OR

Enquiries into certain QUERIES

UPON

D. PIERCE'S Sermon

at Whitehall, Feb. 1.

The third Edition.



Printed for R. Royton, Bookseller to his
most Sacred Majesty.

С Е И Я Е І О

九月廿二日

5.1.1.9. *On the other hand*

Georgian Bibliography



Queries upon Queries.

QUERIE I.

WHether for the Papists with restlesse importunitie to sollicite for an indulgence, be to sit down peaceably and grant themselves erroneous? Do they call that only a *sitting down* peaceably, not to grow *outrageous*, and arming themselves with publick force to fight for their Religion? or is it not moreover not to repine at their present happiness, and to *desist* from *craving* any publick favour? If you grant your selves erroneous, is it fit you should be *indulg'd* in your *errours*? Is it not favour enough to be *conniv'd* at, when there are such *sanguinary laws* in force against you, which, if his Majesty so pleas'd, might be put into execution? Or if he should *gratifie* you, since you are so *erroneous* as to *advance* the *Pope's Supremacy* above that of *Kings*, whether when you have gathered strength by being *cherished* under his wing, will you not take the boldness to assert what you have now the *confidence* to affirm, and proceed from *humble desires* of publick favour and indulgence, to *impudent demands* of publick Countenance and settlement? If so, whether it be not *seasonable* to give the King a *Carveat* against such *Dissenters*, who are wont to *sit down* peaceably no longer then they must needs?

QUERIE II.

Though his Majesty had *declared* his *Resolution* against your *Doctrines* before, yet was that *Resolution* so strong that 'twas impossible to *fortifie* it: or were there like to be no *assaults* made against it? If not, whence come your frequent *desires* of a

Toleration : If there were, was there not need also of a *Confirmation* ? Do you not too much over-value the *Courtiers*, when you say they neither know the *Fathers* and other *Authors*, nor can judge of those quotations the Sermon does referre to ? If they don't know, nor can't judge, must you needs imply them so stupid as to be incapable of instruction ? If they have no reason to suspect them, nor ability to view or disprove the quotations, why may they not satisfie themselves without an *Ocular search* ? If they have, they are submitted to their *Examination* as well as yours, and 'tis no question but you will both find them to be exact. How could the Preacher know but that *some of you* would hear him ? He might assure himself you were usually present, though not as *Auditours*, yet as *Spies*; if not to be converted by it, yet to pick quarrels at the Sermon. And presuming you there, why might he not intend to convert you, when he knew that what he delivered was able to persuade you, if it did not meet with prejudices more invincible then your judgments to subdue ? Might not the *Discourse* be directed to check your *insolence*, who upon the King's *Declaration* began to walk undisguis'd ? or to prevent the growth of *Popery*, that though you compass'd Sea and land, yet you might gain no more *Proselytes* by your industry ? or---&c.

Q U E R I E III.

Suppose we should say, by what was from the Beginning we mean *Primitive examples* : Can these be no rule of *Reformation*, because we are not to doe as men have done, but as men ought to doe ? Does not the same *Reason* destroy all *Patterns*, and oblige us to abstain even from doing well, because others have done so before us ? Christ, to reform the *Pharisees*, sends them to the Beginning for a *Rule* ; we, to reform the *Romanists*, send them to the Beginning too. If Christ did as he ought, why may not we imitate him, and at the same time doe what has been done,

done, and what ought to be done? If not — Blasphemy. If to doe as has been done, and as ought to be done, which you so carefully distinguish, be inconsistent; Is it not easy to inferre, because the Papists doe now as they have done, therefore they doe not as they ought to doe? Suppose again, that we understand Primitive Rules contain'd in Scripture: As for those Articles which lye plain and open, they need not the Light either of yours, or ours, or another's Interpretation to discover them; so that your Dilemma has no horns, or but blunt ones: As for the other, the Querie is, whether you or we more closely follow the confess'd Rules of interpretation. If you have, do you not lay that crime to your own charge, which we endeavour but to prove you guilty of, a partiality in your own cause? If we have, why do you still hugge your own errours, and not rather close with our Truths, while our Arms are open to embrace you?

QUERIE IV.

When you imply that the Preacher in Contending only for the old Protestant way, contended not for that which was from the Beginning: what do you mean by the old Protestant way? That good old way, before it had the Name of Protestant, or after? If before, it was and is the same way which was from the beginning; and did not he in contending for it, contend for that which was from the beginning? If after, he confesses 'twas so call'd p. 36. because the Assertors of it protested against the cruel edict of Worms, and that the Title was almost as novel as a very great part of the Roman Creed is; why then do you say, that he contended only for the New, when 'twas indeed for the old Protestant way? When you say, that the Eastern Churches claim a greater Antiquity then ours; do you mean, the Articles of their faith were more Ancient, or they were more early in embracing them? If the former; why is it not prov'd? If the latter; what is it to the purpose? Do we pretend to have re-

ceiv'd the Christian faith before *all other Churches* or rather do we not avow our selves to own the same *Truths*, which if they receiv'd sooner, yet both of us from the Beginning?

QUERIE V.

It had been said, Sermon. p. 10. *That in matters of Indifferencie which are brought into the Government, every Church has the liberty to make her own Constitutions; but we are to look upon nothing as an Article of Faith, unless it comes from the Beginning, &c.* Which passage did you reade, or no? If not, why do you undertake to make *Querries* upon it? If you did, why do you talk of *Surplices, Organs, Bishopricks, Officials, Pluralities, &c.* and take so much pains to no purpose, unless it be to amuse the *ignorant and unobserving Reader*? Did the Sermon say *all things* must be reduced to what they were in the Beginning, or only *Articles of Faith*? And are *Organs, &c. Articles of Faith*? While you personate the *Fanatick*, don't you talk as impertinently as if *you* indeed were one? But, perhaps, the whole *Querie* was rais'd on purpose to tell the world, the *Preacher* had *Pluralities*. If so, why had you not withall told us, *how he came by them*? Not by *purchase*, but *desert*? not by *seeking*, but *acceptance*, when they were cast upon him? That they are *Dignities*, not *Cures*? But setting all this aside, Do you think him *worthy* of his *Preferments*, or not? If not, why do you bestow *one* upon him: for he was never *Canon of York* till *you* made him. If you do, why do you *envy* him, and discover this *envy*, in reckoning his being *Chaplain to the King* as one of those *Preferments*, when the world knows there's nothing but *trouble and honour*, no *Emolument* at all? Whether therefore is it lawful to *dissemble and falsifie*, or no? If not, why do you doe it? If it be, sure from the Beginning, unless among the *Romanists*, it was not so.

Querie

QUERIE VI.

Whether there be any *Heresie* in the world which never had a *Beginning*? If not, whether it may not be said to begin with its first *Authour* and raiser? If so, whether all of the same *persuasion* may not derive their *Antiquity* from him? Why then may not the *Disciplinarians* fetch theirs as far as the *Heretick Acrius*, who says as plainly as *Epiphanius* can make him speak, that a *Bishop* does not at all excel a *Presbyter*, either in order, honour, or dignity? Whether was *S. Peter* any more then an ordinary *Presbyter* or no? If he was, then he was not the first *Presbyterian*, as you would have him. If he was not, how come his *Successours* to be *Bishops*? If a *Presbyter* and a *Bishop* be all one, why does not the *Bishop* of *Rome* level himself with his brother *Presbyters*? And why may not the *Socinian* look upon *Sabellius*, who, if *Epiphanius* speaks truth, did think such a thing as that the *Son* and *holy Ghost* were no *Gods*, or not coequal and coeternal with the *Father*? But to stir that no farther which stinks already, To what end is your whole sixth *Querie* directed? Is it any advantage to your *Cause*, whether the *Anabaptists* look upon *Agrippinus*, the *Solifidian* upon *Eonomius*, or no? Are you angry that such *petite heresies* should have founders of so great names, while your own great one pretends to *S. Peter*, but has indeed none? Were you not afraid, lest the other parts of your *Pamphlet* should fall under the censure of the *Preacher's* pen, and therefore endeavour'd by such little plots to divert him? If you were, Whether your whole *Religion*, like your *Querries*, have any more then a flattering outside, not to be search'd into by a severer eye then that of a *Novice*?

Querie:

QUERIE VID

When Christ tells S. Peter, his faith should not fail, did he mean it should be impossible to deceive him? Are those Scriptures that speak of full Assurance of faith, to be understood of full perfection of knowledge? When our Saviour says that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church, are the words to be understood of infallibility or perpetuity? To enter into Heaven through persecutions and tribulations, is it not to be saved so as by fire? Were not those imprison'd spirits, the souls of those who perish'd in the Flood, and were reserv'd in some safe, but tolerable custody, till Christ came and preach'd Repentance to them, which, upon their delivery, immediately vanish'd? Or if Purgatory be that prison, is it not an excellent employment for the Pope to be the Gaoler? Was Maximilian the second forc'd by the Protestants, or by the Reasonableness of the thing it self, to write that Letter asserting Priest's Marriage, considering all which Thuanus says is, that he did it *Re ipsa urgente*? Why is it not as lawfull to marry, as to keep a Concubine, one being allowed by God, the other by the Pope only? Why did Scotus say that Transubstantiation was not a Truth before the Lateran Council, if he might not be quoted for it? And when he says *non fuit dogma fidei*, who taught you thus to construe it, that 'twas onely forecast till then? May not a man be damn'd for eating that bread, and drinking that wine unworthily, which represents the Body and Blood of Christ? Again, Did Christ give the Bread to any but Disciples and Ministers, or not? If not, why doe you not withhold this from the Laity too? If he did, how does it appear that he gave them not wine also? If there were none besides Disciples present at the Administration, how could Christ give either Bread or Wine to them, they being not there to receive it? If there were any, by the same evidence by which it appears they were

were there, is it not clear likewise that they received both : When the Christians went from house to house breaking Bread, would it not be a hard case, if they should have no drink to it ? Did they not encourage *Nero* to cloath them with Beasts-skins by confining themselves to Horse-meals, it being fit their garb should be suitable to their fare ? Suppose the *Jewish Liturgy* was in *Hebrew*, could not the *Jews* understand that *Hebrew*, no, not their *Mother-tongue* ? Were not the *Proselytes* to their *Religion* proficients in their *Language* too ? If not, how came they to be *Proselytes*, the only probable way of their Conversion being either by reading the *Jew's Books*, or conversing with their persons ; and could they doe either without understanding their *Language* ? If they were, though the *Jewish Liturgy* were in *Hebrew*, why could they not understand it ? You grant the *Primitive Liturgies* were in *Greek* and *Latine*; were not they the most *Common Tongues*, one of the *Eastern*, the other of the *Western* world ? If ignorance of the *Tongue* had been requisite, why did they suffer them to remain in such known *Languages* ? If praying in an *unknown Tongue* was established by primitive practice before *Gregory the Great's* time, was that practice corrupt or no ? If it was, why did he establish it by an *Ecclesiastical Law* ? If not, how do you reconcile it with *S. Paul's* command to pray with understanding ? *1 Cor. 14.* If *Invocation of Saints* were heard of in *Ignatius* his time, it was not in *Christ's*, who forbids us to pray to *Angels*, which sure are greater *Favourites* then the *Saints*. If an *Universal Supremacy* was from *S. Peter* by right, though it could not be got till *Boniface the third*, did *Gregory the Great* know that it was his *Right*, or no ? If he did, why was he so *injurious* to *S. Peter* himself, and that *See*, as to *disclaim* it, and that with so much *spleen* and *indignation*, as to call him *Antichrist* who should *usurp* it ? If not, how comes the *Enquirer* to be wiser then his *Holiness* ? If that Pope was *Infallible*, then *Omniscient* too ; and if you know more then he, you must know more

then be who knows all things ; then likewise Boniface must be Antichrist, because Gregory says so : If he was not, how did his Successours gain that Prerogative, who had far less knowledge then himself ?

QUERIE VIII.

May not the Catholick Church have many parts, and yet preserve its unity ? As in the same Natural body there are many Members, yet but one Body. Are not the Churches of the several Kingdomes of Christendome these parts ? Whether is it possible for Corruptions either in Doctrine or Government to creep into them ? If not, how came they into the Church of Rome ? If it be, is the Church so corrupted to be Reform'd or not ? If not, why does not our Saviour permit the Pharisees quietly to enjoy their old Customes of Divorce ? If a Member be diseased, may we not endeavour after a Cure ? If it may be Reform'd, what Physician must we consult ? Must we go to Rome for a Remedy ? from whence possibly come our Corruptions, and can we expect a Reformation from them ? Will the same Enemy that sow'd our Tares, pull them up too ? Can the sword which made the wound, become the plaister ? Is not every King Supreme in his own Dominions ? Have we not the same warrantable Rules of Reformation, plain Scripture, Natural Reason, and Moral Prudence, which others have ? If we are Corrupt, why may not he reform us ? Does Christ bid us follow a Multitude to doe evil ? or rather are we not commanded to let them depart from us, and purge our selves to a Primitive integrity ? Is that one way we are all bid to be of to be found in the Roman or the English Church ? If you say in the Roman, where do you reade that ? If in the English, do you not walk in a wrong way, because in a way that is not

QUERIE IX.

Were our *Reformers* here in *England* members of the *Catholick Church*, or no? If not, then the *Roman Church* is no part of the *Catholick*, because they were of the *Roman Faith*, and yet according to you not *Catholicks*. If they were, may the same person be a member of the *Catholick*, and the *Head* of a particular *Church*, or not? If not, do you not split your self upon those dangerous *Assertions*, That a *King* can be no *Christian*, or a *Christian* no *King*? If he may, why may he not reform the *Church* he is *Head* of, as *head* of that part, though not as a *Member* of the *whole*? If therefore those *Members* of our *Church* who desire a farther *Reformation*, were *Heads* of it too, they might reform us: but so long as they are only *Members*, I think they may not; what think you? If it be your judgement, that they may, why might not our first *Reformers*, though *Members* of the *Roman Church*, yet reform it? If you think that the *Head* only can reform, whether is the *King Head* of the *Church* which is in his own *Kingdome* or no? If not, are you not *traitorous*, while you go about to rob him of his *Supremacy*, and do you not deserve *faulour* and *indulgence* from him? If he be, why do you quarrel with our first *Reformers*, when you know the chief of them was the *King*?

QUERIE X.

Whether those points commanded to be believ'd by the *Council of Trent* upon pain of damnation, were to be believ'd upon that *severe penalty*, before the *sitting* of that *Council*. If they worg, then those are damn'd who died before the *creation* of those *articles*, because they did not believe them; how then fare the souls of our *Sires*? If not, was not that a *charitable Council*, to make the way to *Heaven* narrower then

Christ had left it? But supposing, with you, that they were not necessary, the Querie will be, whether they were lawful before it. If they were, then were they not added by the Council of Trent, as you acknowledge they were, but establish'd by a more Ancient Sanction: If not, could that Council make an Article of Faith, which is beyond the power of any Authority under heaven to doe? Gal. 1.8. Can that which is unlawful in it self, be made lawful by a Command? or may the daughters drink poison, because they are bid to doe so by their Mother? or if they might, is not Rome a kind Mother, that will prescribe it? Suppose again, that those points were Antecedently indifferent, such as might be believ'd, or might not; were they enjoyn'd because they might be believ'd, or because they might not? If because they might, then either that doctrine may be believ'd which is not Apostolical, contrary to S. Paul; or those Injunctions were Apostolical, contrary to your selves, who confess they were New. If because they might not, Oh the power of the Council of Trent, which can make us believe those things that an Angel from Heaven may not do! How does it now follow, because a lawful Magistrate may command a lawful thing to be done upon pain of damnation, disobedience to a lawful command being damnable; therefore the Council of Trent may as well command things to be believ'd that are utterly unlawful, upon the same penalty?

QUERIE XI.

What do you mean by the Church? The virtual Church, as you are pleas'd to call the Pope? or the Representative Church, as you alwaies style your Councils? or, as we understand it, The whole Company of Believers? If you take it in this latter sense, the Scriptures and the Primitive Fathers were to be found in the Church; why might we not then have recourse

recourse to them? When we suspected that the Pragmatical Romanists deliver'd to us *Traditions* of men, instead of the *Doctrines* of the *Gospel*, might we not consult those *Oracles* for satisfaction? If in the two former senses, why might we not run from the *Church*, i. e. from the *Pope* and his *Councils*, to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*? If we might, have you any reason to be angry with our *Reformers* for doing what you allow them? If not, do you not advance your own *Constitutions* above those of the *Scriptures* and the *Fathers*, while you will us to obey yours and slight theirs? Again, Let us by the *Church* understand the whole number of *Christians* that liv'd betwixt *Christ's* daies and those of our *Reformers*, call'd by you the *Essential Church*; was there not in that great Intervall of time a succession of different *Ages* and *Centuries*? Did not a part of this whole number of *Christians* fill up those several *Ages*? Do we not call those the *Primitive Christians*, that the *Primitive Church*, which liv'd and flourish'd in the *Age* of *Christ*, or the *Centuries* next succeeding? Had not you in the latter *Ages*, by entertaining new *Articles of Faith*, by introducing other *Doctrines* then what were from the *Beginning*, corrupted your selves, and so became *Separatists* from the *Primitive* faith, truth, and *Church*? Why might not our *Reformers* then make a *secession* from the corrupted *Romanists*, as they did from the purer *Christians*? If there be any difference in the *Schisms*, 'tis this; you separated from the *Primitive* by defiling, we from you by reforming our selves; And which, I pray, is the greater credit?

QUIERIE XII.

Whether when the *Protestants* left *Rome*, they did not take the *Scriptures*, the *Primitive Church*, and the four first general *Councils* along with them. If they did not, why don't you shew

shew us what Total no to which they left them? If they did take them, is it any doubt whether they left them?

Querie XIII.

Whether he that said *Jerusalem* was the *Mother Church* of the *Jews*, did not say *Antioch* was the *Mother*, at least the *eldest*, *Church* of the *Gentiles*? If so, is it possible that *Rome* should be their *Mother* too? If there be *two* mothers, must not *Rome*, which was the *latter*, be a *step-mother* to them? And are they not like to lead a *prosperous* and *happy* life under such an *indulgent* *Matron*, who is *wont* even to *kill* her *children* out of *every* *kindness* to them?

Querie XIV.

If *S. Peter* brought *Christianity* into *Britain*, as *Gildas* sayes, and you consent, whether this will not exempt the *British Church* from any subjection to the *See of Rome*. If ever *Peter* was there (which is a question not to be decided) did he bring it hither before he carried it thither, or after? If before, why must we, who were the *first Christians*, truckle under *Rome* that is our *junior*? If after, was it while he was living, or after his *Death*? If while alive, what will become of your pretensions, that he seated himself at *Rome*, there exercised *Episcopal Authority*, and dying there bequeath'd his *chaire* to *Clemens*, or *Linus*, and the succeeding *Popes*? If in his absence he left a *Deputy*, it will seem strange that one mans *head* should fit *another's* *shoulders*: If not, 'twill be more strange that the *body* should tarry there while the *head* travail'd into *England*. If after his *Death*, are we not beholding to him that he would rise out of his *grave*, and take such a long *journey* to plant the *Gospel* here? And will it not become you who are so much devoted to *S. Peter*, to own us for your *Superiors*, if for no other Reason, yet for the *miraculous plantation*?

Querie

Q U E R I E XV.

Whether you doe well to make a Comparison between Henry 8. and Phocas, who was indeed an incomparable villain. Was not one a King by Birth, the other of an obscure parentage, and by merit but a Centurion? One came to his Crown by rightfull succession; the other to the Empire by the unnatural murder of his Master Mauritus and his children. One had reason to be displeas'd at Clement 7. who had so often deluded him in his appeals, so long usurp'd what was his Right; the other had not the same reason to be displeas'd at Cyriacus, who could not invade his Right, that had no other Right to be invaded but what bloud and rapine could give him to the gallows. Suppose he had been the lawfull Emperour, if he had denied Cyriacus the Title of Universal, and made himself supreme within his own Dominions, he had done well. And did H. 8. who was indeed our lawful King, doe any more then throw off the Pope, and restore his own Supremacy to himself? You applaud Phocas his justice for robbing Constantinople, and placing the Title of Universal in the Bishop of Rome, that being the chief Seat of his Empire; would you have been content if H. 8. when he degraded Clement, had made the Bishop of London Universal, that being the Metropolis of his Kingdome? If not, do you not doe to others as you would not be done to your selves, in permitting Phocas to strip Cyriacus, and not suffering King H. to doe the like to you? If you would, why do you appropriate that title to your selves, while you confess that, if the King had so pleas'd, the Bishop of London might have been as Universal as my Lord of Rome is?

Q U E R I E XVI.

S. Peter saies Christ is the Corner-stone, 1. Pet. 2. 6. you say S. Peter is: which must we hearken to? If S. Peter were a pillar.

pillar, could he be a *Corner-stone* too? Whether S. Paul knew S. Peter or no? If not, why did he not excuse himself for rebuking him, as he did for his reviling the *High priest*, with an *I wist not who he was*? If he did, sure he knew him to be not so much, or no more then his *equal*, when he rebuk'd him so openly, and made no *Apology* for his *boldness* neither. Whether the Pope be not S. Peter's *successour*, as in his *Chair*, so in his *Disimulation* too, because he can pretend to *humility* in the midst of so great *pride*, and exactly *counterfeit* it, while he has such an *Absolute Authority*. Whether from this *Humility* does not proceed his so *inveterate Enmity* to *Ambition* in others, that he will not suffer them to aspire beyond his own great toe. Whether S. Paul might not be *born* among the *Jews*, and yet *Preach* among the *Heathens*; and so though he were an *Hebrew* of *Hebrews* by *parentage*, yet be an *Apostle* of the *Gentiles* by *employment*? If the Pope be *Lord of Kings*, as you say, does he not *Lord it over God's heritage*? Are *Kings*, no part of *God's heritage*? Does not *Christ's Vicar* too much *disgrace* his *master*, by condescending so farre as to be the *servant of the servants of God*? *They that rule over the Gentiles exercise Lordship*; but do our *Lords Bishops* rule over the *Gentiles*? A *Gentile* and a *Heathen*, you say, are all one: and is it not enough to make us *Hereticks*, but you must make us *Heathens* too? and so neither keep *Faith* with us, because we are *Hereticks*, nor suffer us to hold the same *Faith* with you, because we are *Heathens*?

Imprimatur. *Dan. Nicols, R. P. D.*
Arch. Cant. Capel. Domesticus.

Ex ædibus Lambethanis
Martii 21. 1662.

FINIS.